ib supposed to be expressed) having no philoso^ phic truth or reality in them, had their only original from a certain rustic astonishment of mind* proceeding from excess of fear, raising up the phantasm of a Deity, as a bugbear for an object to itself, and affrighting men into all manner of confounded nonsense, and absurdity of express sions concerning it, such as*have no signification, nor any conception of the mind answering to them. This is the first argument,. used especially by our modern Democritics, against a Deity, that because they can have no fantastic idea of it, nor fully comprehend all that is concluded in the notion thereof, that therefore it is but an incomprehensible nothing.

vi. Secondly, another argument much insist? ed <MI by the old Democritic Atheists, is directed against the Divine omnipotence and creative power, after this manner* By God is always understood a creator of something or other out of nothing. For however the Theists be here divided amongst themselves, some of them believing, that there was dnce nothing at all existing in this whole space, which is now occupied by the world, besides the Deity, and tbat he was then a solitary being, s& that the substance of the whole corporeal universe had a temporary beginning, and novity of existence, and the duration of it hath now continued but for so many years only: others persuading themselves, that though the matter and substance at least (if not the form also) of the corporeal world, did exist from eternity, yet nevertheless, they both alike proceeded from the Deity by way of emanation, and do continually depend upon it, in the same manner as light, though co~